

REMARKS

In the **final** Office Action mailed **Error! Reference source not found.** the Office noted that claims 1-13 and 15-17 were pending and rejected claims 1-13 and 15-17. In this amendment claims 3, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13 have been amended, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9 and 10 have been canceled, and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 3, 6, 8, 12, 13 and 15-17 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Office's rejections and objections are traversed below.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee, U.S. Patent No. 5,923,759. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

On page 4 of the Office Action, it is asserted that Lee col. 3, lines 51-59 and col. 7, lines 17-23 disclose "first input-output means for receiving digital data; ...second input-output means for receiving preliminary data," as in claim 16.

Further, in the *Response to Arguments* on page 3 it is asserted that "The first input-output means is a smart card interface (column 3, lines 51-55). The second input-output means is interpreted as one of the other smart card interfaces which receives the MAC (preliminary data) and uses it to determine if

the card is authentic, and based on that allows or disallows the complete transfer of data if the data is not authentic (Lee: column 7, lines 17-34)."

However, it should be pointed out in this respect that a plurality of interfaces 132, 134, 136 are described in Lee at the level of the security module 120 (see part cited col. 3, lines 51-59), they are part of a host computer 170 (col. 3, line 50).

These interfaces are however not included in a microcircuit card and thus differ from the claimed invention where the first and second input-output means are both included in a microcircuit card as recited in claim 16.

In Lee, smart card units are shown under reference 142, 144, 146 but each smart card unit interfaces with a respective smart card interface (see col. 4, lines 53-54, "respectively") and is thus clearly taught in association with a single interface.

As such, Lee fails to anticipate the claimed device of claim 16.

For at least the reasons discussed above, claim 16 and the claims dependent therefrom are not anticipated by Lee.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-13, 15 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) as being obvious over Lee in view of Pyle, U.S. Patent No. 5,737,231. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9 and 10 have been canceled and claims 3, 6, 8, 11, 12 and 13 made dependent from claim 16. As discussed above, claim 16 is allowable as it is not anticipated by Lee.

Therefore, Lee and Pyle, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claims 3, 6, 8, 12, 13, 15 and 17.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

#### SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103. It is also submitted that claims 3, 6, 8, 12, 13 and 15-17 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any

overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional  
fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/James J. Livingston, Jr./  
James J. Livingston, Jr.  
Reg. No. 55,394  
209 Madison St, Suite 500  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Telephone (703) 521-2297  
Telefax (703) 685-0573  
(703) 979-4709

JJL/jaa